

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 03/19/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,649	11/28/2001	Kenjiro Ito	2204-0911944	5736
7590 03/19/2004			EXAMINER	
Russell D. Orkin			YEE, DEBORAH	
Webb Ziesenhei	m Logsdon Orkin & Han	son		
700 Koppers Building			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
436 Seventh Avenue			1742	
Pittsburgh, PA	15219-1818			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				me			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/996,649	ITO ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Deborah Yee	1742				
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication of Reply	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence add	ress			
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION IN THE PROPERTY OF THIS COMMUNICATION IN THE PROPERTY OF TH	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may reply within the statutory minimum of took will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mitute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this com ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.			
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12	2-29-04.					
· · · · · ·	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims		•				
5)⊠ —	Claim(s) <u>1 and 3</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with the Claim(s) <u>3</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	Irawn from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers	,					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 November 2001</u> is Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corresponding to the oath or declaration is objected to by the	s/are: a)⊠ accepted or b) he drawing(s) be held in abey ection is required if the drawir	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	R 1.121(d).			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ a)∣	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in riority documents have bee eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No. <u>09/471,857</u> . n received in this National St	tage			
Attachmen	t(s)						
1) 🛛 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview	Summary (PTO-413)				
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-1	52)			

Application/Control Number: 09/996,649

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 29, 2003 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilton (US Patent 3,490,956).

Wilton discloses in Table 1 of column 3 a cold worked steel sheet alloy with constituents whose wt% ranges overlap those recited by the claim. The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected the overlapping portion of the range disclosed

Application/Control Number: 09/996,649

Art Unit: 1742

by the prior art because overlapping ranges with similar properties such as cold workability and wear resistance have been held to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, see MPEP 2112.01.

Also note specific example, Heat No. 48009, on lines 5-10 in column 5 meets the claimed composition except for slightly lower amount of C. Since applicant has not established criticality of the carbon range (e.g. by comparative test data), then it would seem that a composition with 0.05% C vs. a composition with slightly less (say 0.04%)C would depict a mere difference in the proportion of element without any attendant unexpected results, which would not patentably distinguish claims over prior art.

Even though prior art does not teach carbide precipitates in the steel matrix at 0.1% or more as recited by claim 1, such would be expected since compositional limitations are closely met, and also Wilton on lines 34 to 66 in column 2 discloses the formation of V carbides.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 3 is allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The art of record does not teach or fairly suggest a cold rolled steel sheet having a composition, as claimed, containing at least one of 0.05 to 1wt% Ti and 0.05 to 1.5 wt%Nb wherein an aggregate of 0.5 to 2.0% Ti+Nb is present to form carbides for wear resistance.

Application/Control Number: 09/996,649

Art Unit: 1742

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deborah Yee whose telephone number is 571-272-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1244.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dy

DEBORAH YEE RIMARY EXAMINER